



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,754	07/30/2001	Gopal N. Iyer	60027.0027US01/BS00045	2738

39262 7590 10/20/2005
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

LY, NGHI H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2686

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,754	Applicant(s) IYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Nghi H. Ly	Art Unit 2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-12 is/are rejected.
 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4 is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carney et al (US 5,940,384) in view of Silverman et al (US 6,324,572).

Regarding claim 1, Carney teaches a method of reconciling first format receiver transfer data with second format receiver transfer data (see Abstract and column 2, lines 41-57, "reconfigured" and "automatically reconfigured"), wherein format receiver transfer data designates available cell faces used to transfer a call between cell faces at one or more cell sites (see fig.1, antennas 11 and 29), automatically modifying the first

Art Unit: 2686

format entry (also see Abstract and column 2, lines 41-57, "reconfigured" and "automatically reconfigured") if receiver transfer data of the second format entry is not included in first format entry (see column 2, lines 41-44, "the base station should be reconfigurable in the even of change or expansion in one type of service).

Carney does not specifically disclose comparing a first format entry of the first format receiver transfer data to a second format entry of the second format receiver transfer data.

Silverman teaches a first format entry of the first format receiver transfer data to a second format entry of the second format receiver transfer data (see column 5, lines 42-63 and see column 9, lines 30-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Silverman into the system of the Carney so that fault tolerance of a communication system is improved at low cost and complexity (see Silverman, column 3, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 is rejected with the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 8, claim 8 is rejected with the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

4. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carney et al (US 5,940,384) in view of Silverman et al (US 6,324,572) and further in view of Magnusson et al (US 6,285,874).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Carney and Silverman teaches claims 1 and 5. The combination of Carney and Silverman does not teach determining if the first directed retry list does not include an available cell face identifier of the second directed retry list, and adding the available cell face identifier of the second directed retry list to the first directed retry list if the available cell face identifier is not included in the first directed retry list.

Magnusson teaches determining if the first directed retry list does not include an available cell face identifier of the second directed retry list, and adding the available cell face identifier of the second directed retry list to the first directed retry list if the available cell face identifier is not included in the first directed retry list (see Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Magnusson into the system of the Carney and Silverman in order to provide a method for automatically mapping the frequency/code combination onto the true cell identification (see Magnusson, column 4, lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Carney and Silverman teaches claim 8. The combination of Carney and Silverman does not teach the cell face transfer data is in one of a plurality of Directed Retry List forms.

Magnusson teaches the cell face transfer data is in one of a plurality of Directed Retry List forms (see Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Magnusson into the system of

Art Unit: 2686

the Carney and Silverman in order to provide a method for automatically mapping the frequency/code combination onto the true cell identification (see Magnusson, column 4, lines 30-33).

5. Claim 7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carney et al (US 5,940,384) in view of Silverman et al (US 6,324,572) and further in view of Magnusson et al (US 6,285,874) and Tanaka et al (US 5,335,355).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson teaches the first directed retry list (see Magnusson, Abstract).

The combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson does not specifically disclose retry list is a Reselection List form and the second directed retry list is a Cell Equipage Face form and the step of adding comprises a step of: replacing a no indicator with a yes indicator in the Reselection List form.

Tanaka teaches a Reselection List form and the second directed retry list is a Cell Equipage Face form and the step of adding comprises a step of: replacing a no indicator with a yes indicator in the Reselection List form (see column 2, lines 34-68, see "digital").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Tanaka into the system of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson in order to provide a cellular radio communication system which is capable of selectively using either analog mode or digital mode when

Art Unit: 2686

exchanging radio communication between a base station and a mobile station apparatus (see Tanaka, column 1, lines 11-16).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson teaches the first directed retry list (see Magnusson, Abstract). The combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson does not specifically disclose the first format is Cell Equipage Face format.

Tanaka further teaches the first format is Cell Equipage Face format (see column 2, lines 34-68, see "analog").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Tanaka into the system of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson in order to provide a cellular radio communication system which is capable of selectively using either analog mode or digital mode when exchanging radio communication between a base station and a mobile station apparatus (see Tanaka, column 1, lines 11-16).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson teaches the first directed retry list (see Magnusson, Abstract). The combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson does not specifically disclose the second format is Reselection format.

Tanaka further teaches the second format is Reselection format (see column 2, lines 34-68, see "digital").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Tanaka into the system of

Art Unit: 2686

Carney, Silverman and Magnusson in order to provide a cellular radio communication system which is capable of selectively using either analog mode or digital mode when exchanging radio communication between a base station and a mobile station apparatus (see Tanaka, column 1, lines 11-16).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson teaches the first directed retry list (see Magnusson, Abstract). The combination of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson does not specifically disclose the first cell site data includes a cell site identifier having one or more associated cell face identifiers.

Tanaka further teaches the first cell site data includes a cell site identifier having one or more associated cell face identifiers (see Tanaka, column 7, lines 26-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Tanaka into the system of Carney, Silverman and Magnusson in order to provide a cellular radio communication system which is capable of selectively using either analog mode or digital mode when exchanging radio communication between a base station and a mobile station apparatus (see Tanaka, column 1, lines 11-16).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2-4 are objected for the reasons as indicated in the previous Office action dated 01/18/2004.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 08/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 5 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to do so found in the references themselves so that fault tolerance of a communication system is improved at low cost and complexity (see Silverman, column 3, lines 62-63).

On pages 5 and 6 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that Carney does not disclose cell transfer data used in the process of selecting and switching cell faces for cellular calls and Carney does not describe the cell transfer data required to transfer a cellular call from a cell face of one cellular antenna to another cell face of another cellular antenna, and Carney does not provide for changing cell transfer data.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *cell transfer data used in the process of selecting and switching cell faces for cellular calls and a cell face of one cellular antenna to another cell face of another cellular antenna and changing cell transfer data*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, claims 5 and 8 recite "switch a call" (not *switching cell faces as claimed*).

On pages 6 and 7 of applicant's remarks, applicant further argues that Silverman does not teach comparing cell transfer data because state information and cell transfer data are different types of data.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *comparing cell transfer data because state information and cell transfer data are different types of data*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

On page 7 of applicant's remarks, applicant further argues that the combination of Silverman and Carney does not disclose, implicitly or explicitly, all the claim limitations in the present invention.

In response, the combination of Silverman and Carney does indeed teach applicant's claimed invention. In addition, applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1 and 5-12 above.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (703) 605-5164. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2686

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly

NH Ly
10/15/05

Marsha D Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600